

**STATE COMMITTEE OF INTERPRETERS
DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION
3605 MISSOURI BOULEVARD
Jefferson City, MO**

October 15, 2002 -- Open Minutes

The meeting of the Missouri State Committee of Interpreters was called to order by Loretto Durham, Chair at 10:00am on October 15, 2002 at the Division of Professional Registration, 2605 Missouri Blvd, Jefferson City, Missouri, via conference call.

Members Present:

Loretto Durham Chair (via conference call)
Carrie McCray, Secretary (via conference call -- joined call at 10:35am)
John Adams (via conference call)
Kim McEnulty (via conference call)
Lisa Guillory, Public Member
Sandy Drummond

Staff Present:

Pam Goose, Executive Director
Roxy Brockman, Clerk IV
Shannon Hamilton, Assistant AG
Lucas Boling, Attorney General's office
Trisha Chapin, Contract Interpreter (PR location)
Nick Dignan, Contract Interpreter (joined meeting at 10:30am at PR location)
Jonathan Webb, Contract Interpreter (Flo valley location)

Visitors:

Judy Benfield, Deaf Community (present at PR)
Kay Kottelman (present at Loretto Durham's location)
Eric Driskill (present at Loretto Durham's location)
Mary Luebke, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Lisa Betzler, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Nina Wilson, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Rebecca Odom, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Paul Strosnider, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Sheila Green, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Tina Moore, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Mindy Day, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
LeeAnn Linneman, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Stephanie Taksel, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Linda Russell, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Frank Williams, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Teresa Bluett, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Lisa Shoptaw, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Kendra Griffard (present at John Adams' location)
Kalie Wylie, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Ryan Ridenhour, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Corriene Flanigan, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Gwen Dalmer, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Tif Davis, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)

Jim Walsh, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
JC Browning, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Jennifer Curran, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Donna Wilson, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Ella Eakins, Deaf Community (present at John Adams' location)
Tom Flynn, DCS Program (present at John Adams' location)
Deanna Hausermann, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Susen McBeth, SLCC @ Flo Valley Alumnus (present at John Adams' location)
Ann Brand, SLCC @ Flo Valley – Government Liaison (present at John Adams' location)
Dan Betzler, SLCC @ Flo Valley (present at John Adams' location)
Patti Gray, SLCC @ Flo Valley Alumnus (present at John Adams' location)
Judith Larson, SLCC @ Flo Valley Alumnus (present at John Adams' location)
Julia Murphy, SLCC @ Flo Valley Alumnus (present at John Adams' location)
Becki Bromaghim, SLCC @ Flo Valley Alumnus (present at John Adams' location)

Review and Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Ms. McEnulty and seconded by Ms. Drummond to approve the agenda. All approved.

209.321.6 (Exemptions)

Ms. Goose said that this was a legislative request to be submitted to the Division for review and then for the Division to submit to the Department. She said the Division's legal counsel indicated to Ms. Goose that this was going to be a "do not pursue" item because of #4 in the current statute, the exemption already exists for a person engaged in interpreting incidental to travel. She said it was felt the exemption statute could be broadly interpreted to include individuals who are traveling into the state to interpret at conventions, conferences and any educational field trips. Ms. Goose said that she spoke to the Division's attorney earlier that morning and told the Division attorney that one of her concerns was that #4 just says a person; it doesn't say the person needs to be licensed or certified in another state or by a national certification system which was very important in the lead in language that we were submitting. Ms. Goose said she explained to the division attorney that the language wasn't an attempt to police but it was a way to ensure that should someone come into the state and interpret at one of these conferences, if we were to get a complaint as a result of that, we would have some recourse, we would have another state or national certifying body to fall back on. She said she also shared with the attorney that the existing exemption of interpreting incidental to travel included and had been interpreted in the past to include someone who was traveling through the state and interpreting just as a stopover in the state, not as a assignment. The attorney told Ms. Goose the division would reconsider it. Ms. Goose said she was providing this information as an update to the committee members. Ms. Hamilton told the committee members that she felt it was just a matter of statutory construction, how you are going to read the statutes together and after reading both she said she didn't know that she felt that subsection 4 is broad enough to cover what it is that the committee wants in 321.6. Ms. Hamilton said to begin with subsection 4 requires that this be done in a casual setting or as defined by rule. She said she thought most of the things that the committee was concerned with in the point 6 exemption as far as convention, conferences, and meetings, things like that she didn't know that she would consider those to be in a casual setting. She said the language "incidental to traveling" evokes to her a stopover in an airport or that a person is traveling through as opposed to staying for a convention or traveling interstate. She said if the decision is going to be reconsidered and she hoped it was because she didn't think that subsection 4 was broad enough to cover the exemption that is set forth in 6.

Ms. Goose said that one of the other points made to her was that in that statute it says "in a casual setting and as defined by rule." She said the suggestion was that the committee define

those settings by rule and that the committee could define convention, conference and meetings all of those things by rule. She said at this time it is being reconsidered and she did not know at this point how far it would go.

209.321.7

Ms. Goose said she was directed by the committee members at the last meeting to submit this proposed statute language to the Division for approval. She reminded the committee members that she had told them at that meeting that she did not know how far she could get with it because it was past the deadline but that she would try. She went to the Division Director and Division's legislative liaison and informed them that the decision had been made to submit another change to the exemption statute. They both indicated to her that it was past the deadline and she acknowledged that she knew that but they said that she should prepare the information to be submitted for review. They told her if it was okay it would be sent on to the Department and see what they say since the committee is already submitting a statutory change to the exemption. She said as she began completing all the paperwork that is required in order to submit the language e-mails were received into her office and the Division Director's office from people who were upset and opposing the proposed statute change. She said she and Division Director spoke about the proposed language and that Ms. Goose verified she was preparing the paperwork to submit the language to the Division. She said as the days went on more e-mails came in, but because it was past the Division's deadline and becoming controversial that it was not going to go anywhere. She said the Division has suggested tabling it and attempting to resolve the issue if at all possible. She said she needed to know if the committee wanted this language submitted the way that it is, did they want it submitted in a different language or did they want to table it until December. Dr. Guillory said that she felt we needed to table this until later and gather additional information in regard to how the majority of the deaf people feel about using student interpreters, that we need to get comments from Levels 3, 4, and 5 to obtain their comments about mentoring and we need a way to find out how the majority of deaf people in the state feel about using student interpreters.

Ms. McEnulty agreed with Dr. Guillory and said it would be in everyone's best interest to obtain additional information before making an exemption or statutory change. She suggested gathering more information whether it be from the ITPs, current and previous students, and the deaf community through out the state as well as seasoned interpreters with regard to their feelings on mentoring. She said she thought the information would help the committee to make a better decision or language change to the statute.

Ms. Drummond agreed that there is a need to make a stronger case for whatever decision that the committee makes and that the committee needs to be able to have all of this evidence and information in one place at one time that represents the entire state. She said she was in agreement to table this until the next meeting. She said that this was an opportunity to gather additional information with all of the visitors present.

Mr. Adams agreed with tabling until next regular meeting.

A motion was made by Dr. Guillory and seconded by Mr. Adams to table this proposed language until December and gather additional information. Ms. Drummond, Ms. Durham. Ms. McEnulty and Dr. Guillory all approved.

The meeting was opened up to visitors to provide feedback to the Committee. The following is a comprehensive reporting of those comments.

Ms. Benfield agreed with gathering additional information in surveying the deaf community, the students and the interpreters and obtaining a variety of information. To get list of pros and cons and a more broad perspective of different people's concerns.

Lisa Betzler – I understand that we need to talk about the pros and cons of mentoring however if the Board decides that we, who are members of the deaf community, have to do this I think that we really have the right to decide whether we want mentor or practicum students or not. That is our decision as deaf members of the community. The board has no right to take our power away from us. Right now it feels like we've gone back to civil rights times where we are black people, where we have separate water fountains. It's the same idea. Who has the right to decide for me what type of interpreter that I have. I believe it is the deaf community's right to decide who their interpreter is. It's not the Board's right. So that's my belief and my feeling on the subject.

Nina Wilson - I am not sure that we have received all of the information from SCI. Can deaf people be mentors? I know that there are some issues with licensure and everything with certification and students having mentors that are interpreters, that are highly certified interpreters. However, is it possible that a deaf person could serve as a mentor for someone who is a practicum student? That's something that I have been curious about.

John Adams -- I think that if we discuss this in person at our December meeting we'll be able to have the answer for her because that might be something we discuss as part of the language or if anyone feels they are able to answer that right now, then I open that up to any other board members.

Loretto Durham – One of the big things that most of those e-mails have been addressing is saying that the practicum students would be required to have a mentor with them. We weren't necessarily saying that the interpreter that went with them had to be their mentor. We were just saying that practicum students couldn't go out there without a having a licensed interpreter with them at all times. We never tried to deter deaf individuals from being mentors to the interpreting community. I for one believe that deaf people can teach us interpreters a lot. I would never try and tell a deaf person that they could not mentor an interpreter. I don't believe that that was the goal of this proposed language at all.

Lisa Betzler – I would like to share an example with you. Right now we need to have two interpreters in our meeting. One, however was taken away to go to a medical emergency. So imagine we have two individuals for there, one of them is a practicum student, the other one is a licensed interpreter who is supervising them. So if that person is taken away then what do we do. We then have to sit and watch someone who is a practicum student that does not have the skills requisite for the setting. That's just one simple example. If we have someone who doesn't show up I am deaf person there who loses out. What am I supposed to do in that type of situation? I don't think that it's going work.

Sandy Dummond -- Unless the student interpreter has passed the certification exam and has a level four or five, I would not feel comfortable with them interpreting for the state committee meetings regardless of whether or not they were supervised. Unless they've passed the test and proven their competence I don't expect that they would have the skills to even attempt interpreting a portion of the meeting and certainly not without supervision. So I would expect that we would need to reschedule the meeting in that situation.

Loretto Durham – I totally agree with you Sandy. If this meeting goes long I would be very concerned about having just one interpreter there at the Flo Valley campus. I don't feel that one interpreter should have to deal with the amount of information that is taking place during this meeting. I would be comfortable in saying go ahead and put everything on hold right now if that interpreter can't continue and taking a break until they were ready to interpret again because interpreting services are important. We want to have the standard and having one interpreter there is not the best scenario by far.

Lisa Betzler – Let me be clear. I am just talking about in general. For example, in this meeting we were going to have two qualified interpreters. That was not an issue of having a mentor here. One person had to leave for a medical emergency so we're left with one. This is just an example. I think that we are fine here. The example is, is that what happens if we're in any type of situation whether it's this meeting or not where a student or mentee is there and the certified interpreter has to leave and if they can't interpret or interpret effectively who's the one who suffers? It is the deaf individual. I am trying to draw a parallel between that type of a situation and today. This is a perfect example. We need interpreters in very professional settings and these types of things happen.

Loretto Durham – Lisa, in that situation you're saying that the student wasn't qualified to interpret anyway, why would the deaf person want them there in the first place if they weren't qualified for that situation. That's what we're trying protect.

Dan Betzler – I believe the concern is for the student in regards to if a medical emergency happens and the student is there to mentor with them, not really concerned about the level because that would be mandated but whether it be a novice assignment or an apprentice assignment but rather than the dependency on the certified licensed interpreter and if they had a medical emergency then the student of course loses out. And the deaf person as well.

Susen McBeth – I think what she's trying to say is that if we require mentors for the situation and in a situation like today, say that person's mentor was called away for a medical emergency the student is then left without a mentor and then therefore left without the ability to lift their hands because they don't have a mentor. So, it's not that the student's skills are not good enough for the situation it's now that there is no interpreter because the student is not allowed to lift their hands without a mentor in that situation. So, she's saying that the deaf person loses out because now, there is no interpreter prepared to mentor the assignment.

Loretto Durham – that's just the way happens in every situation. If that interpreter made that commitment to come with the practicum student and oversee the assignment then that needs to be a commitment. If it is a medical emergency that the interpreter is called out to go to, then the individuals in the setting should understand that and if there is no other interpreter to take the medical situation and the interpreter had to leave then the people that are at the meeting should reschedule. They should understand that that is an emergency that has taken place.

Tom Flynn – From a programmatic point of view of the people who run this program here. IF we have 30 students that each have to have 120 hours of practicum that's over 3,000 hours of practicum. There won't be that many medical emergencies, but there will be flat tires, there will be family emergencies, there will be headaches, so forth and so on. Smaller emergencies that still prohibit a licensed interpreter from mentoring a novice in which case it is going to make it awfully difficult for an awful lot of interpreters or interpreting students to get their requisite number of hours.

Mary Luebke -- I'd like to talk to you from the perspective of the shrinking pool of interpreters within the state. The point of having interpreter education programs in the State of Missouri is to

enhance the pool of interpreters and to help the pool of interpreters grow. In order for that to happen, individuals have to have the opportunity to practice. Where we're running into some problems here, in my opinion, is the difference between the term mentor and supervisor and understanding of what is the role in an accredited institution of the individual supervising students. One of the problems is that these students are not yet interpreters. Florissant Valley, Maplewood Community College and William Woods are all accredited by the state. At this point you are not recognizing that state accreditation for competency to supervise students. You are making these students become professional interpreters. The point that there is no interpreter here today just signifies to me that the pool of interpreters is not large enough for a professional assignment much less for this kind of mentoring. It seems that if the pool of interpreters increasing is what we are interested in, that we are not looking at it. There is a perception that this Board is agency driven because four of the members are intimately involved with an agency. There is a perception that this can only be covered by financing by having people paid to do this work. It appears that if this continues it would be a mandate without any way to finance it. Clearly the college cannot absorb the cost. I don't know if the state is willing to absorb the cost to provide these interpreters but it seems to me that if we can't cover the professional assignments we're certainly not going to be able cover the practicum assignments. Secondly, as instructors, frankly we are insulted because you are taking the role of instruction away from a community college and then expecting that college to confer degree when they cannot do instruction. So what will happen is that a certified interpreter instructor will go out with a practicum student and because of the nature of the certified interpreter that then becomes confidential information. Therefore, no one can talk about it. Instruction if the "mentor/whatever person we are calling it here" is not going to give instruction to the student then who is? Therefore, we cannot confer degree because a student has not been given proper instruction. It's my feeling that we're mixing up too many times the difference between mentor and supervised practicum instruction underneath an accredited institution. Deaf individuals here could also mentor. Everything is signed off on. There is no liability because it's completely covered by statements that say everyone knows. As far as the deaf community is concerned, if a deaf person does not want two practicum interpreters then a deaf person has the right to say always "No, thank you. I'm going to get a certified interpreter." There is always deaf involvement when these practicum assignments are sent out and there is supervision and there is liability statements signed and we are an accredited institution. It is our feeling that concerning higher education that perhaps you do not understand how we view that you are trying to take instruction away from the institution.

Nina Wilson – MCDHH, they've taken control over Deaf Awareness Day at Six Flags and at Springfield at Silver Dollar City. Often some of the people at MCDHH they take advantage of the practicum students to interpret at Six Flags and Silver Dollar City Deaf Awareness Day and some of them have had help from the deaf and also the hearing instructors here at Flo Valley and other coordinators with the college. So, now if you pass this law does it also hurt MCDHH this plan for Deaf Awareness Day and for the deaf community to be able to go out and enjoy social events like that and be able to support the community? If you pass that law I think that's what is going to happen. I am curious to know how this is going to conflict MCDHH and their plan. Will they now have to drop those Deaf Awareness Days because there is no money for certified and licensed interpreters and they can't afford interpreting services? Because right now I know that they are suffering for money with the budget cuts. So, what's going to happen with that?

Loretto Durham – I can tell you that they've already looked into plans for that. I talked with Roger when he was coordinating interpreters here at Six Flags. There were a lot of certified licensed interpreters that were interested in working out there but were not given the opportunity to do so because the practicum students were all out there. A lot of the interpreters, it wouldn't exactly be for free, they are given a ticket to come in at another date. Six Flags usually made

some kind of an arrangement to give them a couple of tickets. They were given t-shirts one year. So there are other ways that you can compensate those interpreters. Interpreters that like to get out there and support the deaf community and haven't been given that opportunity. I can tell you that at Fair St. Louis that I coordinate personally, I get a lot of certified interpreters that come down there for free and dedicate a day, a full day, two days, three days, for that whole activity just because they know that there's going to be a lot of deaf people there and that it is a fun and exciting time. I don't believe that's going to be a problem. Those kinds of activities are still going to go on. I think that there are certified licensed interpreters that are interested in doing it and haven't had the opportunity to do so.

Dan Betzler -- MCD did give me a list this year since I coordinate that event. The list they gave me after research I found some that were on the list that told me they were certified and licensed, some were certified and not licensed, some were licensed but had lapsed CEUs. After researching the list they gave me I believe that one of them on the list was able to be used. I did work with mentors, I guess you would say supervisors, at the level of the assignment but I think that we're in a little bit of an idealistic world when we think that working interpreters will give us the amount of time that will be needed. I did just want to bullet my concerns for your December meeting so that they don't need to be addressed at this time but I would like to hear the responses at the December meeting. One is that the faculty's input, I cannot pass the students unless I know what they're doing out there in the community. If we're not going to allow them to do the novice as we agreed to in the July meeting and you voted on in your minutes and you changed at your September meeting. Then I think we put the responsibility to grade the student interpreter on the working interpreter, the licensed certified interpreter, when our students work in settings with a licensed certified interpreter and not require any information as of the RID code ethics which we strongly adhere to. Secondly, what does this mean for the deaf consumer? Does this mean that we now put students in a level three paid assignment, that they are expecting two level three interpreters, or two level three or higher interpreters and put them with a student? Or does it mean that the student only observes in these situations? And I ask you then would you go to a surgeon who has watched the procedure many, many times and let them do it on you as their first case? I think not. I think the deaf community deserves better than that and I think that's what we have tried to do here with our partnership program here at Florissant Valley. I'd like that to be addressed because I think it does focus on financial commitments to the agency and/or the college. Who will pick up these monies that is required to allow mentors? Believe me, if you have 3600 hours which would take to do our last graduating class of licensed certified interpreters with 1.2 CEUs apiece which is 12 hours it would take us 10, I think I have reiterated this over and over, 10 certified licensed interpreters to graduate one graduate from Florissant Valley. I noticed in the recent proposed statute that it says "years of experience" so now the concern is a novice interpreter mentoring or supervising, whichever term you choose to use, will now have years of experience also added to the proposed language eliminating four of the people that might be able to supervise or mentor our practicum students. I wonder about the pool of interpreters as it was addressed by Ms. Luebke and the community itself, I ask you the Board, if you pass something like this I would imagine and will be calling you in regards to mentoring our students in the future but I am assuring you I will not give a grade to a student I cannot see the progress at work and so therefore I just cannot do that as a faculty member. I also wanted to address in your December meeting as to whether or not you are looking at one on one supervision. For example at Six Flags we had one certified interpreter watching the two students work, they weren't working with them. I understand that it was a takeover thing. I respect our profession. I respect interpreters in the state of Missouri for what they do. Unfortunately, I don't always agree with everyone's ethical standards and that is why I chose to teach rather than to practice. My idea of teaching is to tell the students what I think is appropriate and when they come back to the classroom and tell me of some of things that have happened on their assignments with mentors or supervisors I have to say that it scares me when I hear some of the stories of the students working with licensed

and certified interpreters and I have to say, as an instructor, that behavior was inappropriate. I think in the broad scope what I am asking the state to do if this statute is passed is to take on the responsibility of practicum students under the state, to also provide the money that it would take to hire mentors as we know several agencies already have mentor programs in place that cost money. So, if we are going to require the students to do that I think that the state needs to take on the responsibility of both, in regards to faculty and the cost that we the faculty cannot supervise something we cannot see. It is our reputation when the student says I am alumni of Florissant Valley Community College and we make sure that they adhere to a strict code of ethics and their behavior is appropriate to service the deaf community in Missouri. Thank you.

Sandy Drummond – My vision of this requirement of supervision is that it does not interfere with instruction from the interpreter training program. My understanding is that the supervising interpreter would work with the interpreter training program and I don't understand the feeling that the supervising interpreter, who has some sort of agreement with the college to supervise student interpreters when they are actually providing interpreting service, to provide feedback to the college, to the student. I don't understand that the RID code of ethics prevents that. I don't see that the state code of ethics prevents that as long as it remains within the context of teaching. That is similar to the mentoring that goes on now. It's commonly accepted that people involved in that mentoring situation will discuss the performance of the interpretation and the purpose of that is to improve, the purpose of that is instruction, so that is not my understanding of that. I also think that there are also other models for practicum and internship that we should probably take a look at our meeting in December. I think that we can all bring models that we're familiar with, models from other colleges, that describe what internship means in different programs and what the end result of the 120 hours should look like and what the composition of those hours should look like and possibly that would help our discussion also. I would be glad to bring models of other internships at other colleges to the meeting in December and I hope that others at this meeting will also do the same. Possibly that would also help to find resolution to the concern about having a supervising interpreter for interns and practicum students. I think that it needs to be clear that the requirement of supervision was for those moments when the student is actually doing the interpreter and the purpose of that is to ensure the accuracy of the interpretation and to basically cover any liability involved and to protect the consumers of the interpreting assignment. So, that was the thought or the purpose behind requiring supervision. I think if we can bring models and different alternatives to the next meeting that would be very useful.

Mary Luebke -- We are not asking as a state accredited institution for help with models. We appreciate your offering it. Certainly we have looked at models and attended any number of conferences that work with the same kinds of programs we do. So what you're saying, Sandy, is the state of Missouri, your board is suggesting to dictate to post-secondary institutions the models they choose for their practicum interpreting, that would be your responsibility?

Sandy Drummond – No, I don't feel that way. I feel like it's your job to provide the instruction and your job to decide how that instruction should be delivered. My concern is the supervision of students and protection of deaf consumers. I am just saying that if it can't be done in the current model that perhaps there are alternatives that we can look at in which we can accomplish both goals.

Dan Betzler – I think we need to address this concern for the deaf consumer at your next meeting. I have seen some deaf consumers who aren't worried about you being concerned about them.

Ella Eakins – I am just a little bit confused about the situation. Are you encouraging interpreters to improve their skills or is it that you want to have control of these practicum students? Which is it that you want?

Loretto Durham – I don't think that control is what anybody wants or evaluation. We are just very concerned about the students going out there and doing jobs by themselves, just the different things that can come up on those assignments.

Ella Eakins – What is it that you're worried about then? What is it exactly? The deaf people can take care of themselves, we're independent individuals. We're the ones who are paying the taxes. We're the ones who are following the laws. We are doing all of these things. We can take care of our own lives. We are not your dogs. Take care of what you need to take care of and we will take care of what we need to take care of. My point is that you who are members of the board and the school and other institutions are always encouraging students to socialize with the deaf people to improve their skills. So, then when they have a mentor, what is that for? If I am having like an Avon party or something like that or a Tupperware type party, I have no problem inviting a practicum student. If I see assignments being done wrong, I as a deaf person can tell them how they need to improve. I'm not that dumb. I feel like I have the right to do that and I feel offended when that right is taken from me. It's treating me as if I'm stupid or I can't do that job. I can teach them. It's not your language as a hearing person it is ours. A long time ago there was a big communication wall, you know there were no interpreters, there was no captioned TV a long time ago and now we're having more interpreters and that wall of non-communication is crumbling. Now what you are attempting to do is to create another wall to separate us again. Which means that you don't want us to be able to communicate, it creates a communication barrier for us. It feels like we need to throw it back out and do just like what we did with Berlin, we need to take down that wall. I want the SCI to explain to me what your rationale is for this mentorship. What is the purpose of it? I don't clearly understand why exactly you feel you have to have this? What is it that you want to result from this?

Loretto Durham – My understanding of the goal of this legislation was so that we could protect the deaf community and the hearing community that were using interpreting services. It was not to prevent anyone from being able to communicate. It was so that when deaf individuals went to those parties they got accurate information and weren't making commitments to things that they didn't understand. Our goal is for equal access for every one. We weren't trying to stop anyone from providing interpreting services. It's just that the state of Missouri has a law that says that interpreters have to have a license. Students don't have licenses and they're going out and interpreting, that was the whole issue that was what was covered at our last meeting. I, for one, was very hurt at the fact that individuals are going out and saying that we changed our vote on whether or not novice assignments with practicum students would be required to have a licensed interpreter with them. We never voted on that issue. The only thing that we voted on was that they would not be required to have a license. We held the decision as to whether or not they would have to be supervised, mentored, accompanied by, a licensed interpreter for our next meeting. So I was very hurt at the fact that people are going around and saying that we voted one way at one meeting and just because you all weren't there we decided to change our vote. That was not the intent and I want you guys to realize that we did not do that. It was not a decision made. It was not a decision we made at one meeting and changed it at the next.

Dan Betzler ---I just want to know if you read your minutes?

Loretto Durham – Dan, I did read the minutes and if you read them you can see that the second statement says nothing about whether or not an interpreter would have to have a licensed interpreter with them in the novice situations. All it says is that we voted that they would not be required to have a license.

Sandy Drummond – and that was not my understanding of the minutes. My understanding was in July and again I just want to clarify what happened between July and September. In July we had a meeting and we were focusing on the issue of supervising interpreters and an exemption for student interpreters. We realized that the law required the students or anyone who practiced interpreting to have a license or to be exempted. We dealt with that issue in July. Based on the feedback we got I made a motion in the July meeting to exempt student interpreters from licensure in level one settings and did not require supervision. The level three, four and five settings were exempt from licensure but only if they had supervision. We had not decided what to do with the Apprentice or level two certification and that was the purpose of our meeting in September. I see in our minutes that the first motion I made about level one or novice settings failed due to a second. But later on in the minutes you will see that it did eventually pass. Between the meeting in July and September we again were supposed to go out and talk to the people in the deaf community. My community was telling me that I had made a mistake, that I should not have made that motion, that we should require all student interpreters to be supervised and most certainly student interpreters working in situations that require an apprentice certification should definitely be supervised. But, I was told I had made a mistake regarding level one. We came back, we had visitors from the deaf community that also voiced their opinions that we should have supervision for all student interpreters, that they had a right to equal access. It was also brought to our attention that student interpreters would never actually be interpreting in level five situations. The only situations that require a level five are emergency medical, criminal court, things like that and student interpreters would not be interpreting in those situations unless they also had that certification already. So those changes were made based on that input from the community. But it is obvious that we need to have more evidence as to representation from the entire deaf community in the state, not just region by region. That we need a lot more evidence about how this process would work. I can definitely see that is an issue that we need to address at the next meeting. I also don't think that there was ever any mention that deaf people should not be used as mentors in internships. I definitely think they should be used as mentors in internships.

Dan Betzler – The statute itself is eliminating them unless they convert from RID or NAD to CDI.

Loretto Durham – Now, we are not eliminating them in any way. We are just saying that when the practicum students go out that statute would require them to have a licensed interpreter with them. It doesn't mean that they can't have a licensed interpreter and a deaf person acting as a mentor at the same time. The goal was never to eliminate that.

Susen McBeth – I just want to clarify that Sandy, that it was your understanding that you did change your vote from the July meeting to the September meeting and that I am not insulting people by telling people that you changed your vote. You went in and voted for no mentors for novice level in July, came back with feed back from your community and changed your vote in September. Is that right?

Sandy Drummond – Yes, there were changes made between the July meeting and the September meeting. Now all the information is not necessarily correct. In fact, I have seen several e-mails about how we decided to not require supervision of the first two levels, apprentice and novice. That was not correct and that was an error in our minutes at the next meeting that we corrected in September. There was also an additional change that removed level fives from situations that would be allowed for student interpreters to actually engage in interpreting. There were several changes made in the September 20 meeting.

Loretto Durham – Sandy, what they are asking you is at the July meeting was it your understanding that we voted for practicum students going into novice situations that they would not be required to have a mentor.

Sandy Drummond -- Yes, that was my understanding in July. The first motion I made to that effect, failed but the second motion I made to that effect, passed.

Loretto Durham --- It doesn't say anything about a mentor though, Sandy, it just says that they would be exempt from licensing.

Susen McBeth – But that's the point because it says in the previous motion that the three, four, fives, would require a mentor and there's no mention of a mentor they just state that students in an ITP entering a novice situation will not require a license, that exempts them right there without mention of a mentor. Which tells me that they are exempted if they enter a novice level situation with no need for a mentor.

Loretto Durham – I don't believe that was the understanding of the entire committee.

Meeting broke for a 10 minute break

Patti Gray -- I was at the July meeting and I just wanted to go back and reiterate some things that were my understanding. I wanted to thank Sandy for confirming what Susen and I had thought had that passed, level ones would not need a mentor. To address the issue of having these interpreters go out and..... these are not teachers, not certified to be teachers, and therefore I don't know how Flo Valley or William Woods or Maplewoods would be expected to give a diploma or a degree, they have not taught because the job was given to somebody else. One thing that I want to go back to is that...I have a question for you. You agreed that in July there was not to be a mentor for a level one and then you went and talked to some people in your community, came back in September and you had decided you need to have mentors also. Now going back to the meeting in July you had surveyed 5 or 6 deaf people for the survey that you did that said that students needed to be licensed. May I ask how many you surveyed this time?

Sandy Drummond – It certainly wasn't 100. I went back to all the people that I had talked to before to let them know what our progress was, what we had decided. Let me also clearly explain that in the July meeting I made that motion regarding the level one situation and at that time I said I was willing to compromise on level one situations. I was willing to accept that situation and I did not make the motion to change that at the next meeting but I did feel compelled when it came up to for a vote to vote for the new motion. As for the deaf people that I talked to, I talked to the same people I talked to before and I talked to another 4 or 5 more people. So, probably a total of 10 people in my community that represented the deaf community in our area who are involved in interpreting issues that I felt would be good representatives of the community. I did not survey the entire community in my area.

Patti Gray --- My point again is as I brought up in July. How can you try to change legislation based on, we'll give you the majority of doubt, ten people, how can you take into legislation and say that ITP programs have to now have mentors for every student that goes out there for 120 hours per student and because of ten people in your community? Did you survey St. Louis? Did you survey Fulton? Did you survey Kansas City, Independence, Joplin? I can't understand how you can base all this legislation on ten people.

Sandy Drummond – Let me just say that the final decision is not mine. It is the decision of the entire committee. The entire committee is representing the state. I represent Central Missouri.

I represent interpreters from Missouri. I represent deaf people from Missouri. I did survey people that I feel would represent the community. Obviously it is not enough. I am glad to go back and survey more from my community as well as the other member of the committee. I know that John did a survey for his area. The other members of the committee can certainly do the same thing and bring all that information to the next meeting.

Patti Gray – One other issue I would like to address again and I asked you this question at the July meeting and you have brought it up again and again it offends me as a graduate of Florissant Valley, as a graduate ITP student, you again brought the issue of that you have to protect the deaf people and I want to know what, and I asked you this at the July meeting, do you have complaints against students. Do you have things on record that us as students have gone out and hurt the deaf community or deaf people and what are you protecting them from?

Sandy Drummond – My response is that we are protecting them from of the unlicensed practice of interpreting. Student interpreters, all people in the state of Missouri are required to have a license to interpret. We certainly need to provide at least an exemption from the law. There are apparently very good evidence for needing certification and licensure in the first place and the need doesn't suddenly disappear because you have student interpreters. Obviously there was some reason that we needed to have standards in place.

Patti Gray – What was that reason, Sandy?

Sandy Drummond – I have files and files of letters and testimony from deaf people, interpreters that went and lobbied for it. There was all kinds of horror stories of things that have happened. People who were in programs, people who were not in programs. Obviously there was some reason we had to have certification and licensure.

Patti Gray -- I understand that. I am talking specifically to the students and I am talking specifically to the ITP students, not just any person who wants to go out there and say "oh, look I'm an interpreter". I understand that there needs to be certification and licensure but my point is, which was discussed at the July meeting is that Dan and Mary are the supervisors of this program as well as Lisa and Nina. They are the supervisors of the program and as long as a student was enrolled in a certified ITP program they were supposed to be exempt from level one mentoring and now, I don't understand when you survey ten people and you decide you are going to put legislation back in place.

Sandy Drummond – You certainly have the right to question my judgement.

Patti Gray – Thank you. I appreciate that.

Sandy Drummond – But my belief still stands. My deaf community has said to me they deserve to have quality interpreting services, they deserve to have accuracy and that level one situations are just as important as the others.

DeAnna Hausermann -- I keep hearing all this stuff about protecting the deaf. I would really like to know if you are protecting the deaf, why is it that the committee is all hearing people. Where are the deaf?

Loretto Durham – We agree with you wholeheartedly. We have been trying to get a deaf member to represent our committee for two years now. It is a legislative process. We had a governor that died and a temporary governor coming in and taking over. Believe me, we want deaf people on the committee. We have been encouraging deaf people to come to the meeting and we have had quite a few that have come to the meetings so that we could at least get their

opinion even though they aren't actual members. We wholeheartedly agree. We want a deaf member on this committee.

Nina Wilson – I have a question for you. We're talking about the SCI and the rules that were passed out and deaf people being involved in that board. We're not talking about teaching ASL and gaining experience. If a deaf person is not qualified as an instructor, if a deaf person has no qualifications concerning American Sign Language if they are not involved with any kind of sign language understanding. Is it the understanding that any one can be on the board, it doesn't matter what their qualifications are? It doesn't matter if they're teachers? Doesn't matter if they have experience? None of that matters? Their involvement with ASL, all of that is irrelevant, any deaf person? How can that be? Are you going to open it up to all deaf, no matter who, whether they understand the issues or not? Is that what's happening?

Loretto Durham – Nina, I am not sure I understand what that meant. We don't control what deaf person becomes a mentor. We have no authority and would not want that authority. That would be for the ITP programs to decide.

Nina Wilson – I am talking about deaf people on the board. So, we still don't have any deaf people on this committee or on this board. Who can be on this board? That is a question that needs to be answered. Who needs to apply to be on this board? There has been no answer to several deaf people who have applied to be on the board. I have read in e-mail that has says deaf people on this board must not be teachers, must not be ASL teachers and have a certain amount of experience and education and what not. That these people can't be included on the board so that's what I'm just a little confused about. Deaf people have a right to be on this board and I don't think that we should be excluding individuals who tutor or teach ASL classes from being on the board. I don't understand how that works in that way. So, can you answer the question as to who exactly as a deaf person can be on the board and if we are excluding people who teach ASL?

Sandy Drummond – First of all, the requirement for the members on the state committee are included in the statute that created the licensing committee. That statute written, voted on and passed long before we were ever appointed. It was a part of the original package that created certification that was developed and drafted by the Missouri Commission for the Deaf. I personally agree with you that the requirement that the deaf public member should not have any financial interest in interpreting is ridiculous and it excludes the people that have the most experience. I would certainly be glad to talk about changing that because I think that's put a lot of restrictions on us. I know that Carrie McCray and myself and I have asked Judy Benfield, a member of the Columbia deaf community to help me in e-mailing, posting to MO Deaf asking for people to apply for these positions. I've often contacted people that I have encouraged to reply and find out that they haven't done it. Sometimes people are excluded because of those requirements in the law but we're not allowed to nominate our own replacements or nominate people directly from the board. All of those decisions have to be made by the Governor's office. So, I would strongly encourage you to contact deaf people in your community and ask them to apply, assist them with applying. They would contact Marilyn Taylor Williams there at the Division of Professional Registration. That is something that I am actively pursuing trying to get a deaf person on the board and I want to encourage everyone to do that too.

Lisa Guillory – There was a comment in one of the e-mails about people, about the makeup of the board and I just wanted to defend my position on the board so that it would be understood better by the visitors at this meeting that there is no audiology position on this board. Audiology obviously wouldn't be required. It has nothing to do with interpreting. I was asked to be on this board because of a similar problem that for years they could not find a public member to serve on this board. I just happened to be an audiologist, who happens to be able to sign a bit, but

audiologists are not required to be on this board. My profession, I hope, has not entered into any of the voting decisions that I made. It's very, very difficult to get people to serve on boards. I think that Pam and Roxy would agree with me on that and the reason that I was asked to be on this board is only because I had experience on previous boards. I had been on the Commission for the Deaf. I had served as a board member for the Board of Examiners for Hearing Instrument Specialists and I serve on the commission now for Audiology and Speech Pathology licensing. So, I just want to make it clear to the deaf community and to visitors and whoever may have misunderstood that e-mail, that an audiologist is not required to be on this board and that I was asked to be on this board because they were having so much difficulty finding a public member. If they cannot find a deaf member, which is required on this committee, then they'll have even more difficult time finding a deaf public member, somebody to serve as the public representative. So, I just wanted to make this clear.

John Adams – I would like to comment back to something Nina said. She said that some deaf people have applied and they've never heard back and it's been awhile. My experience, I applied to be on the committee back when Governor Carnahan was back in office and alive. I recently got my appointment this past May. So, it took over two years for me to get appointed. So, that could be part of the governmental process is that it takes that long. They may get a letter tomorrow for all we know. That was my experience, Nina, and I just wanted to share that as it may be the reason why people have not heard back.

Dan Betzler – I haven't read the descriptions of each position on the SCI but I was wondering if the fiscal limitation because it seems like everyone on the committee has financial gain from the field of interpreting? So I didn't know whether or not that was just written for the deaf person and not the other members of the committee?

Pam Goose – It's for the public members

Loretto Durham – For the deaf and hearing public members.

Mary Luebke – I want to thank you all for taking this amount of time. I wanted to make this very clear that these are issue situations, not individual situations, these are not directed at any personalities nor are any of the things that you are saying about interpreter programs directed directly to me or to Ula or to anybody. I wanted to make it clear that we are talking about issues, not people. The two things that I would hope you would address in your December meeting is the role of the State Committee of Interpreters in dictating to higher education their policy and secondly, if you would look strongly at the issue of deaf individuals mentoring interpreter students. If you would do that I would be very grateful and I thank you for your time.

Lisa Betzler – I need to ask or survey deaf people if they want mentors or not. I don't want these to be very simple questions such as "do you feel that they should have a mentor or not", you need to be explaining how this is going to affect the deaf community. They need to hear about all of the details behind them. We don't want them to all just say "yes, yes, yes" just automatically. We want them to know what are all the repercussions of this being passed. So, is that what is going to be done?

John Adams – I tried to do that before when I questioned the various people that I talked to and tried to explain, because most of them just made a confused facial expression as to why they would ever use a student interpreter in the setting where I happened to have deaf interpreters for them. So, yes as I go around and talk to other deaf community members and interpreters as well, I believe that I should try to explain it better to make sure it is clear on all the positive and negative effects of having a student supervised by a certified licensed interpreters.

Sandy Drummond – I would be glad to do a town hall meeting. I think that would be a great forum for getting that information from the entire deaf community and explaining it to everyone in the meeting and in a face to face situation and that is certainly something we can plan to do. I am certainly available to do that in my area. I'm available to travel. Is that something we can get done by December 4th with the assistance of the members of the committee?

The committee and public members continued discuss the possibility of town hall meetings and possible dates and locations will be further discussed further at the December 4, 2002 meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. McCray to adjourn at 11:55am. All approved.

Pamela Goose, Executive Director

Date approved by committee